

REMARKS

In the Office Action¹, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,483,586 to *Sussman*, and rejected claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over *Sussman* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,535,596 to *Frey*.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 12-23, and 34, and add new claim 35. Support for the amendment can be found in the application, as filed.

I. The Rejection of Claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Applicants traverse the rejection of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for the following reasons.

Sussman does not disclose, or even suggest, each and every element of these claims. Claim 1, for example, recites a method comprising, *inter alia*, "receiving first user line management information, for a first user of the communications line, specifying first preferences of the first user for communicating with contacts of the first user included in a first address book, wherein the first preferences identify the contacts of the first user and corresponding procedures for handling calls between the first user and the contacts of the first user" (emphasis added).

Sussman discloses a compact telephone directory system that integrates a subscriber's telephone with a local on-line telephone directory database system (*Sussman*, abstract). *Sussman*'s system also includes a Central On-line Database System which allows a residential subscriber to receive updated telephone directories

¹ The Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

semi-annually, monthly, or quarterly (*Sussman*, col. 2, lines 55-60). A subscriber can access the on-line telephone directories as well as the Central On-Line Database System, and can also dial numbers listed in the on-line directory and be notified when the dialed party answers the phone (*Sussman*, col. 5, lines 49-55). The subscriber can also specify that the system continue dialing a selected number until a carrier is detected, and specify a number of attempts that should be tried before discontinuing the dialing of the selected number (*Sussman*, col. 5, lines 55-61).

The Office Action relies on the above-identified teachings of *Sussman* in addressing certain recitations of independent claim 1, apparently relying on *Sussman*'s "on-line directory" as corresponding to the claimed "address book" (Office Action at page 4). However, the claimed "line management information ... specifies] first preferences ... identify[ing] the contacts of the first user and corresponding procedures for handling calls between the first user and the contacts of the first user" (emphasis added). In contrast, while *Sussman* discloses that the subscriber can specify whether a dialed number should continue to be dialed, or whether the subscriber should be notified when the dialed party answers the phone, *Sussman*'s on-line directory merely includes information such as lists of frequently used telephone numbers (*Sussman*, col. 5, lines 49-61 and col. 6, lines 40-41). *Sussman* does not, however, disclose that the on-line directory includes preferences identifying the contacts of the subscriber, or preferences for handling calls between the subscriber and the individuals in the on-line directory. Therefore, *Sussman* does not teach or suggest "receiving first user line management information, for a first user of the communications line, specifying first preferences of the first user for communicating with contacts of the first user included in

a first address book, wherein the first preferences identify the contacts of the first user and corresponding procedures for handling calls between the first user and the contacts of the first user," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added).

For the reasons discussed above, no *prima facie* case of obviousness has been established with respect to independent claim 1. Although of different scope, independent claims 12, 23, and 34 are distinguishable from *Sussman* for at least the same reasons as discussed above with respect to independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 12, 23, and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

II. The Rejection of Claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established with respect to these claims.

Claims 2-11 depend from independent claim 1, claims 13-22 depend from independent claim 12, and claims 24-33 depend from independent claim 23. As discussed, *Sussman* fail to disclose or suggest "receiving first user line management information, for a first user of the communications line, specifying first preferences of the first user for communicating with contacts of the first user included in a first address book, wherein the first preferences identify the contacts of the first user and corresponding procedures for handling calls between the first user and the contacts of the first user," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added), or the similar recitations of independent claims 12 and 23.

Frey discloses a system for processing a call from a calling party to a called party, and the system includes subscriber profiles for both the called and calling parties (*Frey*, abstract). *Frey*'s subscriber profiles may be set up to accept or deny charges based on particular information about the caller, for example, by not accepting charges from callers located outside the country (*Frey*, col. 8, lines 15-18). Subscriber profiles may also include options to treat calls based on the time of day, the identity of the other party, the location of the other party, or language preferences of the other party (*Frey*, col. 10, lines 14-18). However, *Frey* does not disclose or suggest that the subscriber profiles identify contacts of the subscriber included in an address book. Moreover, *Frey*'s subscriber profiles do not identify procedures for handling calls between the subscriber and contacts of the subscriber included in an address book. Accordingly, *Frey* does not disclose or suggest "receiving first user line management information, for a first user of the communications line, specifying first preferences of the first user for communicating with contacts of the first user included in a first address book, wherein the first preferences identify the contacts of the first user and corresponding procedures for handling calls between the first user and the contacts of the first user," as recited by independent claim 1 (emphasis added), or the similar recitations of independent claims 12 and 23, and thus fails to cure the same deficiency in *Sussman* noted above.

For the reasons discussed above, claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 are allowable over the cited references, taken individually or in any reasonable combination, at least due to their dependence from allowable base claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-11, 13-22, and 24-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

III. New Claim 35

New claim 35 is allowable at least due to its dependence from allowable independent 1, as well as further distinguishing features recited therein.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. Pending claims 1-35 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: February 19, 2010

By: 

Steven D. Thomas, Jr.
Reg. No. 64,421